IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 5857 of 1991

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE KUNDAN SINGH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

@

KRISHNAKANT J THAKAR

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

---

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 5857 of 1991
MRS KETTY A MEHTA for Petitioner No. 1
Mr. K.M.Parikh, ASSTT. GOVERNMENT PLEADER
for Respondent Nos. 1 to 6.

---

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE KUNDAN SINGH

Date of decision: 16/07/2001

ORAL JUDGEMENT

This petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents to fix proper provisional pension of the petitioner in accordance with Government resolution dated 31st July, 1987 and fix the final

pension and gratuity amount with interest at the rate of 12% per annum from 31st July, 1987 till the payment is made and for a furtehr direction that an amount of Rs.15030/- for shifting kits and travelling on retirement be released and be paid to the petitioner by the Industries Department with interest at the rate of 12% per annum.

2. This Court (Coram: S.D.Shah, J, as he was then) vide its order dated 11.2.1992 directed the respondents to pay to the petitioner from 1st March 1992, provisional pension at the rate of Rs.1620/- per month and subject to final and correct calculation of provisional pension by the respondent authorities and the respondents were directed to calculate the provisional pension as per the revised pension scheme within a month from the date of the order.

3. The learned AGP has produced on record a copy of the order/letter dated 8.7.93 from the office of the Director of Pension and Provident Fund, Ahmedabad. As per the said order, final pension and retirement benefits have already been sanctioned to the petitioner. In view of this, this petition does not survive. Accordingly, it is disposed of as having become infructuous. Rule is discharged with no order as to costs.

...

***darji